CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 ORIENTATION

Language and society are closely related. Language reflects the society as clearly as the society is reflected in it. The relationship can be studied in various ways. Through the study of language in the society, one can explore the extent to which language reflects and creates our perception of the world. Beyond its role of information exchange, communication and interaction, language plays an important role in guiding our social actions.

If we turn to language and its use, we will find a clear connection between language in use and the unique relations of power in our society. Language plays an important role in producing, maintaining and changing of social relations of power. The present thesis is an attempt to explain how language helps to create, sustain or challenge social hierarchies. Normally, people interact through language without being consciously aware of its giving birth to power relations.

Language is described in different ways. Sapir (1921:08) refers to the nature of language when he writes, “language is purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols”. For Noam Chomsky (1957:13) “language is a set of (finite or infinite) sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements”. J.R Firth has studied language with a different orientation. He is of the view that linguistic meaning can only be thought of by taking into consideration the close relationship between language and society. He stresses that “words are words, not isolates which somehow have meaning in and by
themselves because they function in the particular society in which the speakers happen to live” (Firth 1957:226). Refusing to accept the meaning as a psychological product, Firth argues that it takes meaning “chiefly as situational relations in a context of a situation in that kind of language which disturbs the air and other people’s ears, as modes of behaviour in relation to other elements in the context of situation” (Firth 1957:19). Lyons’ concern (1981:224) is more on social aspect of language than anything else when he says, “the phonological, grammatical and semantic structures of a language are determined by the functions they have to perform in the societies in which they operate”.

Firth does not find Chomskyan linguistics having place for “meaning of life” (Palmer ed. 1968:169). His interest lies in “a general linguistic theory applicable to particular linguistic descriptions, not a theory of universals for general linguistic description” (Palmer ed.1968:190). Michael Halliday, a student of Firth worked upon his views which later developed as Systemic Functional Linguistics. According to Halliday, language is viewed as social semiotic, a resource used by people to accomplish their purpose by expressing meanings in context.

The mainstream linguists have talked about language but they don’t talk much about any relationship between language and power. The work of Michael Foucault has ascribed a central role to discourse in the development of power, specifically hidden forms of power. Since ancient times, power is what is seen, what is shown and what is manifested (and paradoxically, power finds the principle of its force in the movement by which it deploys that force). Those on whom it is exercised can remain in the shade; they receive light only from that portion of power that is conceded to them or from the reflection of it that for a movement they carry.

Power is normally considered to be the ability to get things done and the ability to control. Weber (1947:152) defines power as a situation where one of the participants in a social context can “carry out his own will despite resistance,
regardless of the basis on which this probability rests”. Power is exercised through ‘language in use’ i.e. through ongoing discourse. In recent years researchers who think language as a social phenomenon have become increasingly aware of the need to see language as social resource (Bourdieu: 1982). This means that command of socially accepted forms of language use allows the speaker’s access to positions of power and influence others in different spheres of society. Power according to Foucault (1980:98) “is a force and an effect which exists and circulates in a web of social interaction. Power is employed and exercised through a net like organization, and not only do individuals circulate between its threads they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising their power”. Explorations of the language use by the user guides our understanding of what constitutes power in society and how access to it is controlled by different forms of discourse.

Foucault (1988:83) says, “Power with a capital P is dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body”. In fact, Foucault goes on to say, “There are power relations. They are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or with an institution, or an administration or between a dominating and a dominated class”. Like Bourdieu (1982) he explains, “The characteristic of power relations is that, as agents in the structure, some men can more or less determine other men’s conduct, but never exhaustively” (Foucault 1988: 83). So power relations participate in all, “the strategies, the networks, the mechanisms, all those techniques by which a decision is accepted and by which that decision could not but be taken in the way it was” (Foucault 1988: 103) or in retrospect, that’s the way it seems.

Foucault (1982b: 220) insists that what defines, “a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action which does not act directly or immediately impose upon others. Instead it acts upon their actions, an action upon an action, on existing actions or on those that may arise in the present or in the future. A relationship of violence acts upon a body or upon things it forces, it bends…” He is of the
view that the person who wants to retain his power has to maintain his position till
the end over those whom he wants to exercise his power on so that reactions and
desired results may open up.

If we go deep, we will find that there are social conditions of discourse at
social level, which tell us how social structure at these levels determines
discourse. How this discourse is structured, with some particular ideologies, and
determined by relationship of power in society. Drawing on the work of Bakhtin,
Halliday, Pecheux and Foucault, Frow (1983) theorizes a concept of ideology in
semiotic terms: “…ideology is thought as a state of discourse rather than an
inherent quality (a truth status or a particular thematic structure); it is defined in
terms of its appropriation by a hegemonic class, but because language is the point
of intersection of a network of power relation, this involves no necessary
motivated or stable class correlation: and utterances are thought of as being
formation, structures of the genes of discourse and discursive formation,
structures which are more or less specific and which delimit certain possibilities
of use and certain semantic domains”.

A significant factor in constructing power relationship in a society is
ideology. Power through ideology is “omnipresent in language; language is a
principal means for the operation of power” (Fairclough 1989: 2). People
sometimes embody assumptions about power in language and without a prior
thought to these assumptions, directly or indirectly, legitimizes existing power
relations. These practices and assumptions gradually become universal and
common sense assumptions that originate in the dominant class and become
naturalized. “Ideology, here is taken to be the value of dominant groups in society
which permeates the social structure to the advantage of the already dominant
groups and to the disadvantaged” (Eagleton 1991: 29-30).

Language reproduces ideology. As an integrated form of social behaviour,
language will be inevitably and inextricably tied up with the socio-political
context in which it functions. Language and power cannot be studied without
taking context into consideration of its context. Contexts are impregnated with the ideology of social systems and institutions. As language operates within this social dimension, it must, of necessity reflect and construct ideology.

Gee (1996: 132) considers discourses as ideological because they involve statements about social relations and the distribution of social goods, who is an insider and what is “normal”. This makes the discourses inherently ideological. Discourse determines how power is distributed in society and how ideology is related to power. Each discourse brings out some ideologies at the expense of other discourse. As a result, less powerful discourses and their values and beliefs are marginalized. This can create considerable complexes amongst the members of less powerful discourses, who may find themselves in conflict with the various discourses of which they are the respective members.

Fairclough (1989: 24) gives much importance to discourse than a text. He refers to discourse as “the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part”. Fairclough believes that in addition to the text as a product, are the processes of text production and interpretation. He states that, “discourse then, involves social conditions, which can be specified as social conditions of production, and social conditions of interpretation.” (Fairclough 1989: 25).

Fairclough (1992:19) uses the term “discourse” to emphasize language use as a social practice rather than an individual practice and explains three important implications of this. Firstly, discourse is a source which represents reality but it is also a mode of acting upon the world and people acting upon each other. Secondly, language use as a social practice brings a dialectic relationship between discourse and social structure. Discourse constitutes reality and it constructs reality in meaning. This constructive nature of discourse, however, is constrained by the social structure at the most general level and by institutional structures and relations more specifically. Thirdly, discourse “contributes to the construction of social subjects as well as to the construction of knowledge and beliefs” (Fairclough 1982: 63-64).
Discourse structures reveal how power is acquired, negotiated, consolidated or lost among individuals. It is through discourse that individuals are able to project a self image and identity. It is thus through discourse that the web of interpersonal relationships among the members is constructed and affirmed. The relationship between discourse and social structure is dialectic not determinative. But let us not to understand discourse as a mere reflection of social reality. This is not only a view of discourse as the only source of social reality. Discourse works in “conjunction with other practices which are not discourse, for example economic and political practices” (Fairclough 1992: 65).

Gee (1996) stresses that discourse also focuses on group solidarity which includes how to speak and behave in a particular social role that others will recognize. In other words discourses are “ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities, as well as gestures, glances, body positions and clothes” (Gee 1996: 127). The other way to examine discourse is to consider them as a means of displaying (through words, values, actions and beliefs) membership in a particular social group or social network, people who associate with each other around a common set of interests, goals and activities. A discourse is composed of ways of talking, listening (often, too, reading and writing), acting, interacting, believing, valuing, and using tools and objects, in particular settings at specific times. This enables discourse to display and recognize a particular social identity. Discourses create ‘social positions’ (perspectives) from which people are ‘invited’ (‘summoned’) to speak, listen, act, read and write, think, feel, believe and value in certain characteristic, historically recognizable ways, combined with their own individual styles and creativity.” (Gee 1996: 128). Gee reasserts the idea that discourses “create, produce and reproduce opportunities for people to be and recognize certain kinds of people” (Gee 1996:128). In his views, human beings become different kinds of people in different discourses.
Moving from discourse to text we know that texts are the linguistic manifestations of discourses: “If being an instance of social (political, ideological etc.) practice is one dimension of a discursive event, being a text is another” (Fairclough 1992: 71). And because “texts as the linguistic manifestations of discourse arise in specific social situations and are constructed for specific purposes, these social situations lead to conventionalized forms of texts, or genres” (Kress 1985: 20).

There have been many studies of the ways in which power is exercised in interaction and other forms of conversation between people. These studies throw a light on the prevailing ‘sociolinguistic conventions” about the unequal distribution of power. These theories don’t talk about these conventions as the ‘product of relations of power and struggle for power’ According to Fairclough (1989: 7) “these sociolinguistic conventions have dual relations with power, on the one side they create differences of power and on the other hand they come out as the result of the particular relations of power”.

Fairclough (1989) persuasively argues that linguistic texts and social linguistic conventions integrate power differentials, that they occur out of and are the outcome of power relations and struggles. They also give birth to power struggles. They are embedded, in the common sense assumptions which treat hierarchal social relationships of authority, control and manipulation as somehow the “natural state of affairs” (Fairclough 1989: 64). These common sense assumptions, as Fairclough (1989:64) argues, “are the ideologies that are embedded in language, one commonest form of social behaviour. And in their recurrent, everyday familiar, taken for granted, discourse nature they legitimize the existing different social relations with their power differentials”.

From centuries, philosophers have speculated about the corrupting influence of power. It is a common belief that power changes people. Power induces people to pursue selfish ends. Power holders are typically in control of desired resources, they are likely to find their ideas and views readily agreed with
by subordinates. Power holders may be insensitive to the role that their power plays in producing and demanding only desired responses. As a result they get only answers in affirmation. Consequently, they come to believe that their ideas and views are superior implying that they are superior as compared to others and this result in deriving of resources and privileges that typically come with power. In this way, power holders may come to devalue the worth of their fellows. They distinguish them as they are the objects for manipulation in the service of power holders’ own goals. Thus with the passage of time even the most well-intentioned individual has the potential to be corrupted by power.

Whatever an individual does has social relevance of some kind which defines her/him in relation to others. It is in this sense that power is always involved in one or the other form of social activity. Power is the potentiality that an individual possesses in a social activity and social setting for relative freedom of thought and action. Power often involves getting others to carry out things in such a way that the individual can achieve his/her goal which is essentially the definition of power given by Weber (1949). But it also involves being constrained by others to act in such a way that their goals are achieved, i.e. not only to exercise power but also to have power exercised over others. In such situations resistance by one or another party usually results in conflict.

In some cases resisting force might appear to be minimal because the subordinate might not have any overt means with which to directly express their opposition or the situational context might lead to the shifting explicit resistance. However even under these conditions, resistance does occur, for example, it can take the form of an Islamic woman who wears western clothes underneath the traditional veil or of someone who deliberately gets away from stereotypical roles to achieve his or her ends (Karp and Yoles 1986: 61-86).

Thus when the power holder uses his or her powers in an unfair manner, to attain his or her selfish goals, the relationship between the powerful and the powerless is no longer perceived as just. This will provide the right opportunity to
the subordinates who will attempt to engage in overt or covert resistance. “On a social level, this can lead to the establishment of popular movements and rebel organizations and ultimately to revolution where the power holders are overthrown, often in a violent manner...but because power is, at essence, the ability to attain one’s desired outcomes” (Russell 1938: 38). The conflict between those with power and those without power is a direct consequence of the basic human motivation to achieve control over one’s own outcomes. There is evidence, in fact that having power within a hierarchy and using that power are pleasurable at a physiological level in humans as well as other primates (Tigger1992: ch7).

The purposes for which power is sought are widely sensed but more rarely articulated. Individuals and groups seek power to advance their own interests, including their own pecuniary interest and to extend to others their personal, religious or social views. Power is also sought to win support for their economic or other social perception of the public good for example a religious leader persuades his congregation because he thinks his beliefs should be the views of his community members. A politician seeks the support, which is to say the submission, of votes so that he may remain in the office. Conservatives seek submission to their view of the economic and social order and the associated action. Likewise liberals or socialists seek similar submission to theirs. In all cases people with similar interests, values or perceptions come close with each other because it is in the pursuit of power that the submission of others becomes essential.

As we examine expressions of power, it is important to consider what role personality factors play in and why people might or might not be interested in having power over others. A large body of research has suggested that motives are among the factors that determine how people make choices and what goals they seek. Motives are believed to develop in childhood and are an aspect of one’s personality throughout one’s life. One of these motives is power motivation.
Power motivation is related to a number of diverse behaviours including overt aggressiveness or desire to help others. The power motive has been defined as the inner need or disposition to seek power or a concern for having a strong impact on others (McClelland 1975). Power motivation is not necessarily associated with having power or being successful in exerting power, but rather in the desire to have power.

There are many ways in which power can be expressed. There are many outlets for this motive. Power motivated expressions include an attempt to control power motivated expressions. One can also express power motivation through gaining influence or reputation. Other behaviours associated with high power motivation include the attempt to affect the others’ emotions, and provide advice or help. This behaviour, aggressive or assertive, does not necessarily be obvious, but these diverse behaviours are found to be the ways of exerting power over others. It is true that such behaviour is associated with desire for power.

According to John Galbraith (1984), there are three sources of power. These three sources are personality, property and organisation. Personality can be defined as the quality of physique, mind and speech. In primitive societies personality was connected with physical strength, even today it is a source of power in many communities when they call a male with a muscular physique as powerful. Personality is also associated with the ability to persuade or create beliefs. Property and wealth is another form of power. This form of power can also purchase submission. Organisation has become the most important source of power in modern societies. Organisation is required for the exercise of power. These three sources are combined in various strengths from which comes a varying combination of instruments for the enforcement of power.

Much exercise of power depends on a social conditioning and at the same time the powerful that justifies it by hiding it. Power thus concealed by social conditioning and then revealed seems deeply illegitimate. The exercise of power, the submission of some body’s will, is inevitable in modern society. It is a subject
to be approached with a skeptical mind but not with one that has a fixation of evil. This means that those exercising the power are also purposefully aware of what they are doing. Bernstein (1971: 47) wrote “how a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control”.

Power relations are the dynamics of influences. There is always an element of give and take, of power sharing between rulers and the ruled. Violence becomes an aspect of asymmetric power relation, inevitable in hierarchies.

The present study addresses the issue of how major and minor characters in both the texts foregrounds interpersonal resources in negotiating power in the existing power system in the two texts by Tehmina Durrani i.e. *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy*. The following section provides an overview of the research study, including contextual background information and introduction to the data and theories which have been applied for the analysis of the power relations.

1.1.1 **Objective of the study**

The present study explores the deployment of interpersonal/evaluative resources in seeking the desired results in an existing power system in *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy*. These resources are for expressing the feelings, attitudes and evaluations of behaviour and thus construing relationships between the addressee and the addressed. It seeks to explicitly highlight the covert expectations regarding how well the characters respond to the communal values implicit in the society in order to build an intersubjective relationship with the reader. The premise underlying in this study is that, even though such expectations are not enunciated in the publicly-available criteria, they nevertheless play a central role in shaping up a personality in particular and shaping up the society in general.

More specifically, the study is concerned with the way the writer takes an interpersonal/evaluative stance toward the reader by making him conscious of
what is happening in power dichotomy. The construction of effective interpersonal meanings can be considered as an essential dimension to understand the characters who use power and also on whom power is being exercised.

1.1.2 Focus of the study

While acknowledging interpersonal/evaluative meanings as a key to power negotiations, this study concentrates on interpersonal/evaluative meanings through choosing different lexical items. In other words, this study is concerned with interpersonal/evaluative meanings in the discursive practices of a particular discourse community. More distinctively, it studies these meanings from two perspectives:

1) From an intersubjective perspective, by looking at the relationship established between the power holders and the power seekers in My Feudal Lord and Blasphemy and

2) From an interpersonal perspective, by investigating the relationships between the two.

These two perspectives are based respectively on the framework of Appraisal (Martin and White 2005). The framework has been developed as an extension of the interpersonal metafunction within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), a theory of language as a social system for making meaning.

Within SFL, most of the research has concentrated on the language of published research articles, particularly on interpersonal meanings and on the ways how the meanings are created, while little attention has been paid to the study of power relations in the texts.

SFL research has extensively investigated interpersonal meanings through mood, modality and “evaluative” lexis at the level of lexicogrammar (e.g. Hunston and Thompson 2000). Most recently, the trend of SFL (Hood 2004a,
2004b; Lee 2005) has shifted to investigate the evaluative language by applying Appraisal theory (Martin and White 2005). These studies observe how intersubjective relationship between the addressee and addressed is constructed at the discourse level.

The orientation towards the audience reflects the writer’s ability to produce texts in accordance with “a complex set of conventions, estimations, implied responses and Attitude” (Park 1982). The success of the writer depends on his/her ability to meet the actual, potential or imagined readers’ expectations in presenting a rational argument and evaluating evidence. Through these arguments proper conclusions can be drawn by expressing the writer’s attitude or stance (Jordan 1997). Meeting the demands of interpersonal relations at the discourse semantic level is a challenging task for writers. Interpersonal aspects of language normally involve several variables which are influenced by the socio cultural relationship of interactants (Martin and Rose 2003, 2007).

This thesis expands existing understanding of the role of this awareness in My Feudal Lord and Blasphemy by making Appraisal analysis, which is placed between genre and lexico-grammar (Hood 2004a, 2004b, Martin 2000).

1.1.3 Research Questions

With regard to the present study’s interest in the interpersonal aspect, the main research question is as follows:

How, in the texts do major and minor characters exhibit interpersonal/evaluative resources for creating and resisting the power structure in the given genre?

More specifically, the study will pursue the following questions:

a) What are the trends in the two texts of Tehmina Durrani in terms of Appraisal motifs?
b) What are the ideological stances in both the texts of Tehmina Durrani? Do they vary or have some similarities?

c) How do the characters use language to construct intersubjective relationships with the readers? (And does the use of such interpersonal resources vary according to generic stage?)

d) How do the lexical choices create a web of power relations and how power is negotiated in both the texts?

e) How does the writer’s use of intersubjective resources vary at the different levels and how can Appraisal analysis be used to create and resist power structure?

1.1.4 Data

The data for the study comprises two texts, *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy* written by Tehmina Durrani, a prominent Pakistani writer. She is the daughter of the former Governor of State Bank of Pakistan. She was first married to Anees Khan, the personal security officer of the Governor of Punjab. She divorced her first husband and married Mustafa Khar, but this marriage also could not last long. After having four children, she got divorce from Mustafa. After her divorce, Durrani wrote *My Feudal Lord*, an autobiographical novel in which she has given the detailed account of her traumatic married life with Mustafa Khar, ex Chief Minister of Punjab, Pakistan. The book created a controversy in Pakistan for its detailed description of abuse inflicted on Durrani by her powerful political husband. The book exposes the misuse of Islam to conceal the exploitation of women.

In Post colonial literature, the appearance of women writers is acknowledged which was concealed in colonial societies. Many non-western women writers came forward in this period and made a place in literature. Writers
like Anita Desai, Arundhati Roy, and Nadine Gordimer have placed themselves at
the centre of this literary period. If we study literature written by these writers we
find that all over the world, particularly in Indian subcontinent the act of writing
by a woman is considered as an act of breaking her silence because her repressive
patriarchal society has taught south Asian women to be culturally silent. Their
femininity is essentially the marginalized consciousness that works on the edge of
patriarchal discourse. Such an insight into the marginal self is presented by
Tehmina Durrani in My Feudal Lord.

My Feudal Lord

My Feudal Lord is divided into three parts aptly entitled Lion of Punjab,
Law of Jungle and Lioness respectively. These three sections also present slow
and gradual development of Tehmina Durrani from an ordinary housewife to a
liberated human being who had to struggle for equal rights and women
empowerment.

In the first part of My Feudal Lord, Mustafa is portrayed as a man who
demands total submission. He represses and oppresses his female counterpart.
Tehmina Durrani’s conventional upbringing conditioned by her patriarchal
social environment makes her accept her husband’s physical assaults and sexual
brutality. She keeps on bearing her husband’s tortures thinking them as a part of
her destiny. Her heart rending description of her loveless marriage is disclosed
when she writes, “there was not a day when Mustafa did not hit me … I just tried
my best not to provoke him… I was afraid that my slightest response to his
advances would reinforce his image of me as a common slut. This was a feudal
hang up. His class believed that a woman was an instrument of a man’s canal
pleasure. If the women ever indicated that she felt pleasure, she was a potential
adulteress, not to be trusted. Mustafa did not realize that he has crushed my
sensuality. I was an automatic pilot… responding as much as was important for
him but never feeling anything myself. If he was satisfied there was a chance that
he would be in a better humour. It was at these times that I realized that prostitution must be a difficult profession” (Durrani 1995: 351).

Part two of the text is set in a politically turbulent atmosphere in Pakistan. The text describes the period when Bhutto’s government is overthrown by General Zia’s coup and military regime is established. Mustafa first thinks to get favour from Zia but afterwards he decides to remain loyal to Bhutto. In the meanwhile Tehmina and Mustafa’s relations get worsened. Tehmina’s parents urged her not to file for divorce as it would bring disgrace to her and to her children. This part of the novel also exposes Mustafa’s illicit relations with her sister in law. When Tehmina comes to know about his relations with her sister she resists but the results of her resistance are drastic as Mustafa batters her with the butt of his short gun and strips her nude and demanding her to apologize from her parents. This episode has an oppressive effect on her soul and she describes “this episode would cripple my spirit perhaps beyond salvation. From this movement forward it would be nearly impossible for me to function as an individual. There was not one iota of self esteem left. The shame has burnt it down to ashes” (Durrani 1995: 154).

The last part of the novel describes how Tehmina Durrani revolts after physically ravaged by the wounds inflicted to her by her husband’s revolts. She applied for divorce as to get a final respite. She feels that only through divorce she can get liberation from her husband’s imprisonment. She decides not to be docile, compromising and tolerant any more. She talks to her husband in presence of all, “your marriage according to the Koran was over years ago when you slept with my sister. I have been living with you in sin. The contract stood null and void long ago” (Durrani 1995: 347).

While leaving Khar, Tehmina Durrani was not running away. She, in fact, chose to do the most difficult thing, to write while exposing her marriage as a way of showing feudalism in its true light.
She writes in the book, that after getting her divorce, Mustafa called her and said, “Tehmina, you are nothing any more once you were Begum Tehmina Khar. Now you are just Tehmina Durrani. When you ring up people, you have to introduce yourself as my ex wife” (Durrani 1995:353).

And when *My Feudal Lord* was appreciated not in Pakistan but also in Europe, Khar called her becoming furious over the details of the book. There she reminded him of his earlier taunt, “well, Mustafa, now the world will know you only as Tehmina’s ex-husband”(Durrani 1995:353).

**Blasphemy**

This is another interesting novel by Tehmina Durrani. The novel is inspired by a true story where the distortion of Islam by its religious leaders is exposed.

The novel is again a tragedy of a beautiful woman named Heer who is brutalized and corrupted by her husband, Pir Sain. The text is a struggle of a Muslim woman against all that is contrary to what Islam stands for. The text gives a horrific account of how the custodians of religion are using their special knowledge to exploit people.

The central character in the novel is Heer whom Pir Sain sees and decides to marry her though she is half of his age. Heer’s mother is very happy at this marriage because she thinks the dignity of her family would be restored by this marriage. Pir Sain abuses her body on the very first night of their marriage. Afterwards he controls her mind and soul and Heer is forcibly adapted to a life which no human being can bear. Day after day she surrenders her body to Pir Sain while her soul keeps rebelling as she waits for a moment of peace to come over her.

Pir Sain who is a sexually perfidious personality performs religious duties as a Saint. The circle around him is also a circle of people who support him. They
want only to outrage women behind the convenient curtain of religion. They even don’t hesitate to abuse minor girls sexually. Pir Sain even tires to molestate his own daughter. He makes Heer, his bondage who arranges maids from the house for her God. He indulges in sex with them in front of Heer and even asks her to support those maids in his physical pleasures. Then he forces Heer to submit herself to the sexual demands of his clients. Not only this, he makes videos of his wife surrendering her body to other men and enjoys watching those videos.

Pir Sain forces his son to get married to the same girl who is a victim of his ancestral atrocities. And his second son is compelled to marry a girl who happens to be his biological sister.

The story basically tells about the power of religious leaders in a society of illiterate people. Tehmina Durrani has successfully exposed the mullahs and maulvis of Pakistan who indulge in black magic and make the innocent people their followers. But when someone tries to point a finger at them, he is subdued by saying that the accuser is guilty of Blasphemy.

There are many extensive stories that have been presented in the novel where these maulvis influence on innocent young girls and beautiful women and then making them prey of their lust. As long as everything has been kept as a secret, the society never blames these religious leaders who are responsible of all the sins. But if one of the victims tries to revolt by making everybody know about the sins, then they blame the victim but not the responsible one.

As these two texts expose how power corrupts men we found these texts as the perfect examples for the present research as the data for the study.

1.1.5 Key terms

This section discusses two key terms for the present study:
(a) The interpersonal

(b) Intersubjectivity

The interpersonal

With regard to the interpersonal, the research has conceptually drawn on Halliday’s (1973, 1978) notion of the interpersonal function of language. This work is motivated by Halliday’s interpersonal meaning and social role relationship between the writer and the reader. Hyland’s (2002: 34) view of “writing as social interaction” corresponds with Halliday’s (1973: 66) “forms of interaction and social interplay with other participants in the communication situation”.

In SFL terms, their notions of social interaction are concerned with attitudes reflecting power and solidarity between the participants. In the “social-interactionist orientation, what is at stake are the writer’s assumptions about the reader’s ability to reproduce his/her intended meanings” (Hyland 2002: 40).

Intersubjectivity

The definition of the concept of intersubjectivity can be thought of with reference to individual’s socialization from an SFL perspective. In the process of socialization, one’s intersubjective development is construed through participation with others in creating both a language and the social reality embodied in that language (Halliday 1978). Painter (1989: 21) views intersubjectivity as the sharing of “our experiences of ourselves, of each other, and of the environment”. Experience plays an important role in defining intersubjectivity. The notion of intersubjectivity stresses on a shared consciousness between two or more persons with different subjectivities (Bakhtin 1981). In relation to the cultural and social contexts, the writer constructs a dialogic positioning with the reader in reference to shared value orientations. In this respect, the SFL concept of intersubjectivity could be seen as parallel to the
notion of “writing as social construction” (Hyland 2002: 40) where members of a community interact in accordance with patterns and conventions “reflecting shared sociocultural understanding of that community” (Hyland 2002: 40). While the traditional SFL view tends towards a more retrospective interpretation of intertextuality, more recent Appraisal theory (Martin and White 2005) has offered methods for prospective or anticipatory interpretation.

The present study is concerned at the broad level with the construction of interpersonal meanings, including how meanings are construed intersubjectively and how values and linguistic/rhetorical conventions are constructed in the interplay between texts. The details of these theoretical conceptualizations are elaborated in theoretical framework.

1.1.6 Methodology

The present research undertakes the study of the lexical resources under the term ‘Appraisal’. These lexical resources are used to grammaticalise the interpersonal meanings in a text and in doing so it endeavors to analyze how interpersonal meanings create power structures in a text. In other words, how through Attitudes and Intersubjective Positioning, power is sought and gained and at the same time how it is resisted in the society.

As it is practiced normally in discourse analysis one can start with either a ‘top-down’ or a ‘bottom up’ perspective (Martin and White 2005). For Attitude, this means “starting with prosodies and working down to their realizations or starting with prosodies and working back to the mood of the text” (Martin and White 2005: 70). We have taken ‘bottom up’ perspective beginning with inscriptions. The tables and graphic representations are made to show results. All the terms related to Appraisal theory are used with their first letter in capital and the different categories and their subtypes are written in italics. The analysis has been done using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Along with the qualitative analysis, quantitative analysis is done through realizing Appraisal
values with in texts beyond the clause or word level. The texts under study are analyzed by following the subsequent steps:

1. Analysis of the selected passages from both the texts i.e. *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy* by picking out the lexical motifs in the Appraisal system.

2. The Appraisal motifs are counted separately.

3. The analysis has deployed all the subtypes of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation chapterwise.

4. The source of the Attitude and what is being appraised is also mentioned separately.

5. Analysis of the Appraisal motifs showing positive and negative choices.

6. Analysis of the lexical choices displaying the subtypes of Attitude.

7. Analysis of the inscriptions showing subcategories of the subtypes of Attitude.

8. Analysis of the motifs exhibiting inscribed/evoked Attitudes.

9. Analysis of the motifs showing the amplification of Attitudes.

On the basis of the findings shown in the tables and graphs, the conclusions are drawn and generalizations are made. The abbreviations used in graphs and tables (same as used by Martin and White 2005:71) are as follows:

+ ‘Positive Attitude’

- ‘Negative Attitude’

des ‘Affect: desire and fear’

hap ‘Affect: un/happiness’
1.1.7 Significance of the study

As already indicated in Section 1.1.3, this thesis presents a systematic exploration of the interpersonal and intersubjective positioning of both the texts by taking some extracts for analysis from the texts. It aims to contribute to a better understanding of the construction and expression of writer’s evaluations in relation to the existing power structure.

The present study aims to contribute to linguistic domains. This study adds to a comprehensive understanding of the construction of interpersonal meaning. The present thesis has endeavoured to find out how power works in society. For this, Systemic Functional Linguistics, particularly Appraisal framework, has been applied. More specifically, it enables us to see how Tehmina Durrani conditions and uses evaluative resources to construct an intesubjective relationship with readers in the context of existing power system in *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy*. 
This study also aims to broaden our understanding by expanding an area of the main linguistic theoretical framework, Appraisal theory, in the area of evaluation.

1.1.8 Organization of the Thesis

The thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 gives an overview of the research focusing on the purpose and motivation—why intersubjective meaning is important in a text. The chapter explores how interpersonal meaning creates power structure in a text. It also describes the research design of the study. Besides that, this part of the chapter gives a brief account of Tehmina Durrani’s *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy*. The second part of the Chapter 1 reviews the research literature on Appraisal theory and the concepts of power and ideology from SFL perspective. The third part of the Chapter 1 presents the study’s theoretical framework, focusing on Genre and Appraisal theory in order to articulate an integrated framework for exploring interpersonal meaning in the two texts i.e. *My Feudal Lord* and *Blasphemy* by Tehmina Durrani. Chapter 2 analyses the texts, showing how characters in different situations employ interpersonal/evaluative meanings particularly through Affect. Chapter 3 deals with the theoretical implications do analysis of Judgement motifs. The study is done through the analysis of some selected passages from the texts to find out how motifs related to Judgement construct and deconstruct power system. The chapter 4 analyses motifs related to Appreciation in the data and it attempts to study the ideological implications in the language that has been foregrounded by the analysis. The last chapter concludes the results of the findings including suggestions for further research.
1.2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Although much work has been done to analyze literary texts yet not much has been done to examine literary texts from Systemic Functional point of view and particularly from Appraisal framework as its branch. Since the present research has taken SFL and Appraisal theory as its framework, a brief review of some of the studies in this direction conducted at national and international level will help us to find the accuracy of present framework. The review will help us to formulate, precisely, the dimensions of the problems under study and it will also set the necessary guidelines for research and explore the possible areas, which need to be studied. The chapter explores Appraisal particularly as one of the most appealing system in the study of evaluation.

The review aims at understanding that Appraisal motifs of a text help not only in understanding of a text, but also explores how thematic issues can be explored through Systemic Functional Linguistics. For this reason, a brief review of some of the studies related with power and power relations is also presented in this part of introduction.

Halliday (1978) points out that language arises in the life of the individual through an ongoing exchange of meanings with others. He is of the view that a social reality or a culture is itself an edifice of meanings -a semiotic construct. In this perspective, language is one of the semiotic systems that constitute a culture; one that is distinctive in that it also serves an encoding system for many of the others.

According to Halliday, language expresses social structure and the social system representing metaphorically in its patterns of variation, the variation that characterizes human cultures. Saussure studied that linguists have used language as its object of study though others think language to be an instrument, a means of illuminating questions about something else. Language plays a central role in the development of a child as a social being. Language is the main channel through
which he learns to act as a member of a ‘society’ in and through the various groups and to adopt its “culture”, its mode of thought and action, its beliefs and its values.

In his views, language without taking account of social man cannot be considered because language is the means by which people interact. The concept of language as behaviour; as a form of interaction between man and man is, turned around, as it were, so that it throws light on the individual. The formation of the personality is itself a social process, or a complex process of social processes and language by virtue of its social functions plays the key part in it.

All human beings put language to certain types of use, and all of them learn a linguistic system which has evolved in that context. Which aspects of the system are typically deployed and emphasized in one type of use or another is determined by the culture, by the system of social relations in which the child’s growth takes place. The notion of “developing a language” means, adding to its range of social functions. This is achieved by developing new registers. Halliday views register as a set of meanings that is appropriate to a particular function of language, together with the words and structures which express these meanings.

Michael Toolan (1998) talks about how language works on texts particularly in texts related with literature. One has to involve some use of linguistic terms and concepts to see the working of language and to give some attention to grammar. Appropriate linguistic terms and descriptions can articulate an inward understanding of the working of language. Toolan has taken some texts as problems and has tried to solve these problems with SFL model. The chief feature of stylistics is that it persists in the attempt to understand technique of writing. Stylistics is crucially concerned with excellence of technique: traditionally its attention has been directed to such excellence of craft in works of literature. According to him stylistics can be treated as a three stage activity. Firstly there is the task of understanding the particular language subsystem under scrutiny. Then it can be used to answer quite specific derived questions
concerning the text. Finally, one can answer questions of a broader nature with wider implications on the basis of such close studies. He examines the linguistic means by which sentences are woven together to make texts which is called cohesion. Cohesion refers to all the linguistic ways in which the words of passage, across sentences crossrefer or link up. Toolan talks about modality which means variety of different things in different academics and cultural domains. In linguistics these are the cover terms for the ways that are available to speaker with in a language for expressing “opinion or attitude”(Lyons1978:452) He also discusses the techniques of speech and thought, presenting narrative structures, word choices, and textual revision.

Mary Talbot, Karen Atkinson and David Atkinson (2003) wrote about language and power. They explore the ways how power works in the linguistic practices that people engage in. Power in language is certainly not a “powerful language” but “power is more than an authoritative voice in decision making; its strongest form may well be the ability to define social reality, to impose visions of the word. Such visions are inscribed in language and enacted in interaction (Gal 1991: 97). From this perspective, language is where forms of social organization are produced and disputed and at the same time where people’s cultural identities come into existence.

Two other particularly useful concepts of language and power are concepts of hegemony and symbolic capital. These two concepts are also covered in this book Hegemony implies as hidden or covert operation of power. It refers to control through consent and to achieve “compromise equilibrium” in ruling the subordinate groups. The concept of symbolic capital presents another way of accounting for the dominance of standard American English.

Geoff Thompson (1996) states that the study of language needs a correct start. The book is based on how language functions as a system of human communication. Complete analysis of any sentence will inevitably need to take account of both the meaning and the form of the sentence. By systemic method
one can choose between form and meaning. He concentrates on the ways of dividing the sentence into parts and to look at the particular functions which each part serves. The different kinds of elements that make up sentences are reviewed. Technical terms that are specific to Hallidayan functional grammar, or that are used in a special sense are explained in the book.

Three kinds of meanings in a text are explored in this book. He talks about three metafunctions, three kinds of function in the clause and three kinds of structure in the clause. Geoff explains experiential, the interpersonal and textual metafunctions in detail. The interpersonal metafunction states that interaction having a purpose for saying things to other people is an inherent part of language use means that there must be some aspects of the grammar that can be identified as enabling us to interact through language. The most fundamental purposes in any exchange are of course, giving or demanding a commodity of some kind. The commodity that the speaker may be giving or demanding is information. He gives four basic speech roles giving information, demanding in formation, giving goods and services and demanding goods and services. In textual metafunction, normally the stress is on to see how speakers construct their messages in a way which makes them fit smoothly into the unfolding language event.

Paul Simpson (1993) states that an ideology derives from the taken for granted assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups. And when an ideology becomes the ideology of a particularly powerful social group, it is said to be dominant. Thus dominant ideologies are mediated through powerful political and social institutes. One perception of these institutions will be shaped in part by the specific linguistic practices of the social groups who comprise them.

The critical linguist raises many issues concerning the interrelationship of language and ideology. One of these is to do with the way in which dominant ideologies become integrated in everyday discourse. They become rationalized as “common sense” assumptions about the way things are and the way things should
be. A process of naturalization takes place to the extent that people are often no longer aware of the hierarchies and systems which shape their social interaction. Simpson takes four categories of point of view in fiction i.e. partial and temporal point of view, point of view on the psychological plane, and point of view on the ideological plane.

Simpson gives an introduction to the system of transitivity in language. Transitivity in a language is a system which forms an important component. It helps to account for the “ideational” aspects of point of view by showing how our experiences of events and activities are encoded in grammatical configurations of the clause. The transitivity model also constitutes a framework of analysis in its own right.

A D Edwards (1976) has written about the use of language, how language tells us about people; about their social background, aspirations and loyalties, their perceptions of each other and of situations in which they interact. He is concerned with the social side from sociological perspective on “the means of speech in human communities, and their meanings to those who use them” He says language is part of a whole process of interaction, its meanings are inseparable from its context and it tells us far more than is carried on the surface of the words. It may be patterned in ways which reveal or define who the speakers are, what their relationships are, and how they perceive the situation in which they speak. A “socially realistic linguistics” tries to account for these patterns. It is not concerned with idealized speakers but with “persons in a social world” who must know “when to speak “when not” what to talk about, with whom, when, where and in what manner” (Hymes 1972: 277).

Edward accounts that Weight Hills looking at language as a whole system of social control, a means of describing and evoking common sense patterns of social behaviour. Morally men perceive situations and anticipate the consequences of conduct in terms of vocabularies of motive, moral categories through which interaction is defined, controlled and accounted for. The observer
of a particular society must discover what motives are regularly ascribed to actions within it. An individual’s speech may “betray” his social origins against his will or without his knowledge. It may also be intended to proclaim his social identity or affiliation.

Edward provides a background of three interrelated areas of investigation social class differences in speech, and in what language is used to do, and the special characteristics of class room talk.

According to Edward speaking is the first and primary mode for communicating competency in all the areas of skill and knowledge. It is the main means by which children daily demonstrate their ability to meet the behavioural and academic demands of the classroom. Sociological analysis concentrates on socio-cultural influences which arise from the distribution of power and opportunities in society at large.

Norman Fairclough (1989, 2001) talks about language and power and also discusses how unequal relations are created through language. The book discusses how language works in maintaining and changing power relations in society. The book analyses how language reveals these hidden relations and how people become aware of them, resist and change them.

The book is divided into chapters. The first chapter gives the basic information of how language works in power structure. Chapter two, three and four discuss the interrelationship of language and society mainly focusing upon power and ideology. Fairclough is of the view that language connects with society because of main domain of ideology and struggle for power. Chapter five and six provide the description of texts with a focus on processes of producing and interpreting texts. Chapter seven and eight emphasize on how discourse changes with the changes in society. Chapter nine and ten bring into focus how CLS can contribute to struggles for social emancipation. Chapter ten also discusses about
the implications of “globalization” and “neo-liberation” about language and power.

Fairclough suggests that power affects our language but he does not mean that power is “just” a matter of language. He is of the view that power exists in different modalities, including the concrete modality of physical force and this brings resistance in society and resistance have always brought change with it. In his views resistance and change are continuously happening but the effectiveness of them depends on people’s consciousness of domination and its modalities. The book aims to contribute to the general rising of consciousness of exploitative social relation by focusing upon language.

He also explains the interrelationship of language and society, with the emphasis upon power and ideology. Language connects with the society though being the primary domain of ideology and struggles for power. So he focuses upon power and ideology by stressing upon two major aspects of the power/language relationship; power in discourse and power behind discourse. He talks about three types of constraints which powerful participants in discourse can exercise over the contributions of non-powerful participants. These constraints are constraints on contents, relations and subjects. Common sense in the service of power is explained upon how ideologies are embedded in the features of discourse which are taken for granted as a matter of common sense.

Bertrand Russell (1938) is concerned with various sources of power like kingly, priestly and revolutionary power. He tries to examine how we can enjoy the advantages of state power while taming its excess. Political economy has helped the writer in analyzing power but not to a great extent. He feels that in a competition free enterprising democracy, a wealthy man has the power to achieve his goal, so we can say power is virtually synonymous with wealth.

Bertrand Russell finds a big difference between power over commodities and a power over human beings. He arrives at Keynes’ point that it is better for a
rich man to tyrannize over his bank balance and over his fellow men. Like Hobbes, Russell is of the view that political force is required to project people from tearing each other to pieces; but unlike him he values the best bet as democracy. But he also feels that democracy has little chance of mixing in Eastern Europe and Asia. Russell is concerned in this book to prove that, “the fundamental concept in social science is power, in the same sense in which energy is the fundamental concept in physics”. Russell also touches some important issues of that time i.e. the rise of Stalinism and Fascism. He clearly sees that today’s problem is “the taming of power”. He also states that democracy has very little meaning without economic equality and a proper education system that can promote tolerance and toughmindedness.

Bourdieu (1992) is of the view that there are many ways in which linguistic exchanges express relations of power, there are variations in accent and vocabulary. Individuals also speak with different degrees of authority. Words can be used as instruments as tools of intimidation and abuse, as signs of politeness, condescension and contempt. Language is an integral part of social life. Bourdieu follows the development of Levi-Strauss’s work and has incorporated some features of Levi-Strauss’s method. Bourdieu also turns to a different body of writing on language, namely to Austin’s work on speechacts. While Bourdieu praises the speech-act theorists for giving attention to the social conditions of communication, he thinks Austin has not fully unfolded the consequences of this view when an authorized spokesperson speak with authority, he or she expresses or manifests this authority, but doesn’t create it. The spokesperson avails him or her of a form of power or authority which is part of a social institution and which doesn’t stem from the words alone. Bourdieu is concerned to demonstrate that whatever power or force speechacts possess is a power or force ascribed to them by social institution. The utterance of the speech of that institution act is part, so the idea of an ideal speech situation in which the rational character of communicative exchange would be unhindered by social constraints is a notion which is based on a fictitious elision of the social conditions of language use.
Foucault (1992) has given a new theory in his book. He disapproves the idea of repression of sexuality in western society. He is of the view that western culture has long been fixated on sexuality. He thinks by not mentioning sexuality, the society has created boundaries around it. They have created sexual identities that would not have existed otherwise.

Foucault considers power relations are centered to any analysis. In Foucault’s views power is not an exclusively negative force. Instead he finds power as the, basis of the analysis of any society. In his book he claims that sexuality and sexual conduct is not a natural category, rather it is a question of social constructiveness.

John Galbraith (1984) is of the view that power yields strongly to the rule of three. These three instruments yield or enforce power. These three are; condign, compensatory and conditioned power. Condign power wins submission by the ability to impose on alternative to the preferences of the individual or group that is sufficiently unpleasant or painful so that these preferences are abandoned. There is an overtime of punishment in the term and this conveys the appropriate impression. The individual refrains from speaking his/her mind and accepts the views of another because the expected rebuke is otherwise too harsh. Condign power wins submission by inflicting or threatening appropriately adverse consequences. Compensatory power wins submission by the offer or an active reward by giving of something of value to the individual so that he submits to his will. Praise is a form of compensatory power. It is a common feature of both condign and compensatory power; in one in the compelled form and in the other in the form of reward. Conditioned power, in, contrast, is exercised by changing belief, persuasion, education or the social commitment to what seems natural, proper, or right causes the individual to submit to the will of another or of others. Conditioned power, more than condign or compensatory power, is central to the functioning of the modern economy and polity and in capitalist and socialist countries alike.
John Galbraith is of the view that everyday language comments regularly in the reasons for which power is being pursued. If it is narrowly confined to the interest of an individual or group, it is said to seek for selfish ends. It reflects the interest or perception of much larger number of people those involved in it though they are inspired leaders or statesmen.

R. Martin and David Rose (2003) focus on meaning beyond the clause, on resources that lead from one clause to another as a text unfolds. They invite the grammarians to reconsider meaning in the clause from the perspective of meaning in texts; and to reconsider social activity as a meaning we negotiate through texts. They have taken Systemic Functional Linguistics as a framework for discussion to show how language works in social context.

They discuss about two perspectives for looking at the phenomena of discourse. One is three levels of language; language as grammar, as discourse, and as social context and the other are three general functions of language in social context. These three metafunctions of language; the interpersonal, the experiential and the textual, also recognized by SFL model of language are discussed in five chapters. They discuss about the relation between grammar discourse and social context. According to them, social activity, discourse and grammar are different kinds of phenomena, operating at different levels of abstraction.

In this book the theory of Appraisal is discussed, which is concerned with evaluation; the kind of Attitudes that are negotiated in a text, the strength of the feelings involved and the ways in which these values are sourced and readers aligned. Appraisals are interpersonal kind of meanings which realize variations in the tenor of social interactions enacted in a text. They begin with Appraisal in order to foreground the interactive nature of discourse, including written discourse. Ideation and conjunction are also discussed elaborately in the book. Ideation focuses on the content of a discourse and conjunction looks at
interconnections between activities. It also discusses about how to reformulate, sequence and explain these activities.

Martin and White (2005) have extended the Appraisal model of interpersonal meaning alongside Modality and Mood. They bring out the subjective presence of writers/speakers in texts. By taking some texts for analysis, Martin and White assert how writers/speakers approve and disapprove, applaud and criticize and how they expect their readers to do the same. The book also reveals how writers/speakers construct their texts to make their readers intended or ideal readers. The book provides an outline of SFL situating Appraisal within SFL, as a model of language and social context.

Martin and White lay stress on interpersonal meaning. Until 1990 interpersonal meaning was more concerned with interaction rather than feelings. But with the advent of Appraisal, a more lexically- based perspective was developed giving a richer understanding of interpersonal meaning in monologic texts. They discuss the Appraisal theory in detail. Attitude is discussed with its kinds. Attitude is a framework for mapping feelings. The three kinds of Attitude are discussed in details i.e. Affect, Judgement and Appreciation. The overview of these resources of Attitude is illustrated with texts and their analysis. They provide a framework for characterizing the different possibilities for investigating the rhetorical effects associated with various positioning.

Martin and White also focus on some patterns where certain types of evaluation are preferred to others. These styles can be related to particular rhetorical effects and construct particular authorial identities or persons.

Martin and White demonstrate some of the ways in which Appraisal systems can be used to inform our interpretation of evaluation in text. They are concerned with the interaction of Attitude, Engagement and Graduation in relation to the social context variable tenor. Texts may differ in meaning making possibilities. This variability depends upon the social context in which the text
operates. These social contexts rely upon the social roles and relationships of those involved in the communication.

Korner (2000) takes judgments of appellate courts as texts for his research. His concern for the study is the negotiation of tradition and authority in judgments. He also finds out intersubjective positioning in relation to authority. He focuses on three themes in his thesis: one is the unequal distribution of power between those inside the legal system and those outside the legal system. Another theme is the mismatch and lack of communication between layers and common masses, and a third theme is the construction of reality in the courtroom through language. He uses three frameworks for his study: legal discourse, critical discourse analysis and Systemic Functional Linguistics. He has taken the assistance of topological model of Engagement and Graduation for his analysis. His focus is on that all structural elements of a judgment are dialogic but different elements draw on various kinds of dialogues and to different degrees. The thesis concludes with a discussion of legal discourse as a discourse of power and solidarity.

Avinash Chander (2009) traces the interplay of linguistic structure and function in Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things. First he discusses language and its structure from linguistic point of view. Then he concentrates on the functional approach towards discourse and language. For discourse analysis he has chosen some extracts from the text then analyzed them at transitivity level. Analysis of Mood and modality is also done showing their subject and finite. He also analyses the clauses for thematic and information structures. After all the analysis, the interpretation is done on ideational, interpersonal and textual patterns.

His research attempts to trace those linguistic structures that the author has employed to those linguistic structures that the author has employed to exchange her ideas about the issues of caste gender and class with the readers. Avinash is of the view that being a fictional narrative Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small
Things deals with the exchange of information. The analysis brings into focus that the dominant Mood used in the text is declarative mood. It suggests that the text is designed to provide information to the readers. At thematic level it is found that Roy has used both marked and unmarked themes in the text. His analysis reveals close relationship between linguistic structure and function. The different meanings employed by Roy have fixed the corresponding structures.

Ingrid Fountain (2001) in his paper gives us an insight into the ideology on the construction of discourse of letters to the editor of three magazines: “time”, “machete” and news week letters to the editor is a part of any magazine where readers can put the views. They can support or disregard the ideas and facts taking place in the world. M.A.K Halliday’s theory of transitivity is applied to bring out the ideological meaning hidden in the lexical choices. The results show that in spite of personal and subjective views in the letters, there are expressions also of social disparities, power and the interests that sustain the social relation. These letters also influence opinions or justify sets of beliefs which are embedded in the existing ideologies.

John Mc Andrew (2001) in his paper analyses a newspaper advertisement by the Australian NSW Government for the NSW Forest Agreements. SFL model is used as a theoretical framework of study to find out the foregrounded elements of the text. The establishment of intertextual heteroglossic relations in the text are tried to discuss through SFL model. The purpose of the analysis is to explore how discourse is represented in the text and how meanings are given to the new social practice.

Arlene Harvey (2004) in his paper investigates discourse communication of two leadership styles transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Here again SFL model of language is used as a framework to analyze the ideational and interpersonal meanings of the text. Ideational pattern used by the author brings out the different strategies of metaphor and negative material processes to communicate to his employees, a pleasing vision of the future. Then
he used Appraisal theory to reveal interpersonal meaning. The Appraisal analysis exposes significant differences between jobs and his staff in their approach to the deadline issue.

Dona Miller (2002) in the paper provides a theoretical framework to examine “facts” of the case before the US Supreme Court. Some strategies are used in the paper for construing and legitimating speaker stance emerging from the investigation and some thoughts are given on the multiple US supreme court sentence as specific specialized text, the text has been approached with Hallidayan perspective of “Language as social semiotic” The paper focuses in the ‘specialized site of Engagement’ where conflict and negotiation are construed by speaker.

Kumiko Kawashima (2004) analyses texts selected from a Japanese women’s magazine “With” and its Australian equivalent “Cleo”. The author uses SFL as framework to examine the lexico-grammatical structures of the texts to find out the constructed relationship between the writer and the reader in the texts. The researcher arrives at the conclusion that the tenor of “With” texts contains more unequal power relationship, lower contact and low or no affective involvement. The tenor of “Cleo” text contrasts to “With” contact and high affective involvement between the writer and the readers.

Shlomo Argamon, Kenneth Bloom, Andrea Esuli, and Fabrizio Sebastian (2006) have tried to analyze and find out a method for the automatic determination of complex sentiment-related attributes such as Attitude type and force by applying lexicon of adjectives and adverbs. The method used in the paper for determining Attitude type and force of terms is the method proposed by Esuli and Sebastiani (2005). The terms are given the representations based on their Word Net glosses. The results indicate that shared semantics of siblings in the taxonomy is not well represented in the Word Net glosses. The paper indicates how information given in dictionary can be used to automatically determine the type and force of Attitudes expressed by terms. They found that though
effectiveness coming from experiments is not high, the improvement with respect to the baseline is relevant, where the feasibility of automatic construction of lexicons is shown. They feel that future work will improve the methods more than theirs by refining feature choice and processing from glosses.

Tran Thi Hong Van and Elizabeth Thomson (2008) use Appraisal theory as the framework for analyzing interviews with different stakeholders who are attached with post graduate sector to find out the quality of post graduate education in Vietnam. They try to provide explanations for some of the problems concerning the quality of post graduate education. They feel that quality of education will go down in Vietnam because of the Minister of Education’s insistence to increase the number of PhD holders to 19000 by the year 2015. They found after the analysis that all the interviewees admit that the quality of post graduate education in Vietnam is low. The problems faced by different stakeholders are different. Students emphasize on facilities. Teachers are more concerned about finance and politics. Management talks about students, teachers and the ‘system’ as a whole.

Jeremy Fletcher and Jon Patrick (2006) have applied Appraisal theory to compare movie reviews. Their focus is on those parts which help the task of sentiment classification on movie reviews. Sentiment classification deals with the problem of detecting positivity and negativity of a document. They are of the view that Appraisal theory describes how views are expressed in text. So they find it a useful tool for sentiment analysis. In this paper, they try to isolate the areas of Appraisal theory that are much useful in sentiment analysis.

Kenneth Bloom, Sterling Stein and Shlomo Argamon (2007) apply Appraisal framework to detect adjectival and adverbial Attitude groups. Sometimes, they find it easy finding that everything described by Attitude could be constructed as opinion; the opposite is not necessarily true. Their goal was to detect expressions that are construed in the text as opinions rather than as facts. In their results, they have got high precision in determining opinionated sentences.
This success gives way to the idea that this kind of lexicon – based approach is good enough in precision of opinion making. They find that of Engagement system of Appraisal theory is closer to what the NTCIR task considers to be the opinion. The Engagement system explains how the writers form beliefs and how they position their beliefs. This system includes the distinctions regarding how writers express facts and whom they attribute the facts to.

Wu Siew Mei and Desmond Allison (2003) in their paper examine forty argumentative essays of under graduate essays rated as “A”, “B” and “C”. Rating is done by their teachers with “A” standing for high “B” for medium and “C” for low. This rating is done to explore various linguistic resources which have been used to convey evaluative meanings. The theoretical framework of Appraisal theory established by Martin and White is used for this purpose. In the result they find that in all the argumentative essays Appraisal resources are used, but to different degrees and in different ways to produce more or less effective claims. They conclude that the differences, though, are relatively fine grained, are not simple matters of the presence or absence of particular Appraisal systems. They contribute to, but do not actually determine, the overall success of an essay with in an institutional context.

Wu An Ping (2008) tries to explore text- theme in the Pearl Harbor address to the nation with in the framework of Appraisal theory. It examines how the grammatical resources of Appraisal can disclose the addressor’s evaluation of the text theme. The writer’s aim is to check the practicability of Appraisal theory towards the exploration of text analysis .The findings of the analysis indicate that out of the total number of Attitudinal types Judgement encompasses the most, and the least is Appreciation whereas only five cases are concerned. Wu An- ping through the analysis has proved that through Attitudinal resources how the addres sor expresses his Attitude in the text to correlate the expose of text theme. Attitudinal positioning in a text particularly in divergent texts encodes the hint of
text-theme to some extent. The results show that the expression of text theme will confine the choices of Attitudinal resources.

The focus of Dona Miller (2004) in this paper is a borrowed term of candling, “alterity management”. Alterity is taken as “naturally” happening in socio-cultural contexts and discourses. The Dona Miller makes use of Appraisal system and Engagement system. The context of situation is discussed in detail with the explanations of Field, Tenor and Mode. The next part of the paper discusses Engagement system. The paper successfully explored linguistically and discursively constructed alignment and alienation in President Bush’s 12 September, 2002 speech to the UN. The analysis has proved that Engagement resources ultimately construe “an alterity rejecting position”. It is proposed that these findings are seen as illustrating the “choose-nation” rhetoric (Longley 2002: Miller) which shows the struggle for US hegemony of meaning making practices in current post 9/11 global crisis context.

Divya (2008) has tried to examine the cohesive devices in an open ended text (Memoir by Dong Rickard, a computer centre manager at the Australian Institute of Marine Science at Townsville in North Queensland) a relatively less open text (Book review in linguist list 16, 20, 58; Sat, Jan 02, 2005, Review: Discourse analysis: young and Harrison (2004) by Salvio Menendez) and a closed text (Privacy policy (H.J. Heinz company(“Heinz”))). The aim of the paper is to find the frequency and distribution of cohesive devices in different text types. The analysis exhibits the occurrence of cohesive devices depends on the text type; the more open the register is the more are the cohesive devices being employed. The findings indicate that the most extensively employed cohesive devices in different registers are references. The analysis also shows that ellipsis/substitution happen to occur open registers more often than in restricted ones.

Avinash Chander (2008) in his article throws a light on existing power relations in Arundhati Roy’s “The God of Small Things” by taking a piece of selected extract from the novel. He has analyzed this extract from transitivity
point of view. He stresses that because of society embedded with power structure Arundhati Roy’s God of Small Things is no exception. The analysis reveals that strong and powerful people of society suppress the weak and the helpless. Avinash has successfully made an attempt to illustrate the way power relations work in south Indian socio-political scenario. His analysis aims to discover the ways socio-political power is linguistically represented in a piece of fictional discourse. The novelist’s use of clauses at transitivity level makes it clear that she wants to bring out the power relations working in the society in general and in the text in particular. She has used participants, processes and circumstances which bring out the fact that Inspector Thomas Mathew turns out to be a controller.

The above review shows that different writers have used Appraisal framework effectively to put forward their specific point of view. Systemic Functional Linguistics seems to be an effective tool to understand how the writer uses evaluative stances to bring the alignment / disalignment with the reader.

1.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The main objective of any research is to arrive at the solution of different problems with the help of systematic techniques and tools. The present research aims at how power is negotiated in the two texts, My Feudal Lord and Blasphemy. The theoretical framework for the study is the Appraisal theory developed within the Systematic Functional Framework by J.R. Martin and his associates. In this section of the Chapter, Systemic Functional Linguistics is explained. It is also discussed why it is considered to be a beneficial framework for the present study. It then moves on to examine the analytical fame work of Appraisal theory.

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

SFL is a linguistics theory developed by M.A.K Halliday (1994) and his colleagues (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, Martin 1992). The theory is focused upon the relationship between language and context in which a text occurs. SFL
is recognized as a very useful descriptive and interpretive framework for “viewing language as a strategic meaning making resource” (Eggins 2004: 2). SFL also aims to understand the quality of texts, why a text means what it does and why it is valued as it is (Halliday 1994: xxix). Halliday’s main purpose is to construct a grammar for “text analysis; one that would make it possible to say sensible and useful things about any text, spoken or written, in modern English” (Halliday 1994: XV).

Systemic Functional Linguistics is a theory of language which takes into consideration the situational and cultural context of a text while analyzing its meaning. The two perspectives are viewed as integral part to look at language. These are; inter organism and intra organism. In the inter organism perspective, language is viewed as “something that happens between people” while in the intra organism point if view it is viewed as “something that goes in the mind of the individual”(Halliday 1978:12-16, 56-57) However Halliday is more interested in the inter-organism point of view and SFL falls within the area of inter-organism perspective. Language is functional, that is language is used by people to satisfy human needs and to achieve social goals. Thus, Systemic Functional Grammar is semantically oriented. It is linked with language in use; how people use language to make meanings, and how language is structured to make meanings (Eggins 1994). In that sense Systemic Functional Grammar represents a major contrast with the theory of language that is assumed in legal reasoning and interpretation, which is that of language as a system of rules. In Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) language is a resource to make meanings, not a meaning to convey pre-existing meaning (Reddy 1979).

Furthermore, SFL is not concerned with sentences but with texts. Three aspects are important here. Firstly, text includes spoken and written texts. Secondly, texts are semantic units, “instances of linguistic interaction in which people actually engage” (Halliday 1978: 108). As a consequence, in this view texts are not composed of sentences but encoded in sentences. And thirdly, text
represents choice and is selected from the total set of options available to the members of a culture. It can be defined as “actualizing meaning potential” (Halliday 1978: 109).

The term “text” refers to any instance of language that makes sense to someone who knows the language. A linguist views text from two different angles. One is to focus on a text as an object. The other is to focus on it as an instrument for finding out about something else. When a text is considered as an object, the focus remains to find out why does the text mean what it does? And why it is valued as it is? (Halliday 1995a) When a text is focused as an instrument it is kept in consideration what the text reveals about the system of the language in which it is written or spoken. These two perspectives are complementary. A linguistic cannot explain why a text means what it does except by connecting it to the linguistic system as a whole. Similarly he cannot use a text “as a window on the system unless he understands what it means and why it means so” (Halliday and Mattheisson 2004: 03).

Halliday (1978:139) views a text as an instance of linguistic interaction in which people engage themselves to exchange meanings. He further states that language “consists of texts”. A text is “any passage (of language), spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole” (Halliday and Hasan 1976:1). Halliday and Hasan (1985:10) assert, “the important thing about the nature of a text is that, although when we write it down it looks as though it is made of words and sentences, it is really made of meanings it has to be coded in something in order to be communicated, but as a thing in itself, a text is essentially a semantic unit”. Halliday again states(1978:136) that “a text can be long like a novel or short like one word; it may not have any clear boundaries like clauses or syllables and therefore may be without a beginning or ending. The integral thing about a text is that it is meaningful, purposeful and complete with in its social and cultural context”.
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Systemic Functional Linguistics views language as a social semiotic, a resource people use to achieve their purposes by expressing meanings in context. SFL is a theory of language centered on the idea of language function. While SFL accounts for the syntactic structure of language, it places the function of language as central e.g. what language does, and how it does, in preference to more structural approaches, which place the elements of language and their combination as central.

Language is seen as semiotic potential so the description of language is considered as description of choice. These choices can be based on semantic, lexico-grammatical and phonological levels depending on the context in which the language is being used.

SFL starts at social context, and looks at how language both acts upon, and is constrained by, this social context. A central notion is stratification that means language is analyzed in terms of four strata; context, semantics, lexico grammar and phonology. Context concerns the Field (what is going on), Tenor (the social roles and relationships between the participants) and the Mode (aspects of the channel of communication). Now we will concentrate on context and how language in use is concerned with context.

Context and Language

SFL considers how people communicate in context, using meaningful structures of utterances as their unit. The interpretation of social context includes two levels of communication, genre (context of culture) and register (context of situation) (Martin 1992: 495).
Culture is an amalgamation of our values, beliefs, customs and traditions and all these are expressed through verbal and non-verbal language. Context of culture “can be thought of as the general framework that gives purpose to interaction of particular types adaptable to the many specific contexts of situations that they get used in” (Eggins 1994:32). Genres are culturally evolved ways to achieve goals involving language. They are “staged, goal oriented social processes” (Martin 1992: 505) in which people are attached with their culture. They are, ‘social because we participate in genres with other people; goal oriented because we use genre to get things done; staged because it usually takes us a few steps to reach our goals.” (Martin and Rose 2003: 7-8) Each genre is characterized by a clear structure with a clear beginning, middle and end through which the function of the genre is realized.

Now we turn to the context of situation. Halliday (1978: 28-29) opines, “we don’t experience language in isolation but always in relation to a scenario, some background of persons and actions and events from which the things are said to derive their meaning. This is regarded as the ‘situation’, so language is
said to function in ‘contexts of situation’ and any account of language which fails to build in the situation as an essential ingredient is likely to be artificial and unrewarding. Searle (1979:117) is also of the same view when he says, “there is no such thing as the zero or null context for the interpretation of sentences. We understand the meaning of such sentences only against a set of background assumptions about the contexts in which the sentence could be appropriately used”.

There are three variables of context of situation that determine the language choices described by Halliday (Halliday and Hasan 1985:12) and his colleagues in terms of the variables of Field, Mode and Tenor. These variables function together and are responsible for making of language features in the text. Halliday and Hasan (1989:39) define register as a “configuration of meanings that are typically associated with a particular situational configuration of Field, Tenor and Mode.” These are called variables for they differ from situation to situation though being present in every situation.

The field of discourse refers to, “the social action that is taking place, what is it that participants are engaged in, in which language is an essential component” (Halliday 1985:12).

The tenor of discourse refers to “who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles, what kind of role relationships obtain among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationship of one kind or another, both the types of speech role that they are taking on in the dialogues and whole cluster of socially significant relationship in which they are evolved” (Halliday 1985:12).

The mode may be defined as “what part the language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has (Halliday 1985a:12).
According to Martin (1992) text structure is produced at the level of genre, as part of the realization process, generic choices select field, mode and tenor options associated with particular elements of text structure. The interpretation of context includes two levels of communication, genre and register, with register functioning as the expression form of genre, at the same line as language functions as the expression form of register. Martin (1992: 495) schematizes this three plane model as shown below:

Figure 2: Three Plane Model (1992: 495)

Martin (2001:45) clears that field is concerned with systems of activities involve; tenor is concerned with social relations, as these are enacted through the dimensions of power and solidarity; and mode is concerned with semiotic distance, and this is affected by various channels of communication through which we undertake activity (field) and simultaneously enact social relations (tenor).

Martin (1999) considered genre beyond the field, mode and tenor framework. He introduced a model of social context. In this model, genre is a
system where field, mode and tenor selections are comprised which unfold in recurring stages of discourse. As stated earlier Martin defined genre as a staged, goal oriented social process. (Martin 1997b, 2000C, 2001C) There can be many genres in any culture and are manageable.

From the point of Appraisal, there can be range of evaluations that the genre creates to achieve its goals by passing through one stage to another. Eggins and Slade (1997) consider Appraisal having a number of spoken genres that includes narratives of various kinds and gossip. The present thesis looks at the rhetorical organization of a text from interpersonal point of view. It is an attempt to find the answers of how the genre negotiates power and solidarity with readers, and how the unfolding of a text into Appraisal analysis contributes to that negotiation. The thesis focuses on theory supported by Martin and Plum (1997) who are of the view that Appraisal analysis has tended to focus on narrative in functional linguists. The table given below suggests how register categories correlate with metafunctions of language.

![Figure 3: Register recontextualised by genre (Martin and White 2005; 32).](image)
SFL places the function of language at the centre in preference to other structural approaches, which place the elements of language and their combinations at centre. SFL explains language as a mode of social action considering language and social context as systems of meanings.

SFL also takes into consideration how people use language, how language is used to express their experiences of the reality, how they demand or offer goods and services etc. Language has many functions; the ways in which human beings use language- the meanings that we can make with language- are classified by Halliday (1978: 36-58) into three broad metafunctions (Bloor and Bloor 2004: 10-11)

(1) The ideational

(2) The interpersonal

(3) The textual

The Ideational Metafunction

According to Halliday through ideational function the speaker or writer shares his experience of the real world through language. He also expresses his views of the internal world, his perceptions and his reactions. Halliday classifies ideational function into two subfunctions; the experimental and the logical. The experiential is chiefly related with content or ideas. The logical functions stresses on the relationships between ideas. Eggins (2004:213) is of the view, “when we look at the experiential metafunction, we are looking at the grammar of the clause as representation”. To bring out the experiential meaning in a language, the system of transitivity is used. Transitivity is the linguistic representation of extra linguistic experiences. There are many options available to the speaker to encode his experiences in transitivity system. He can represent his experiences through processes, participants and circumstances attached with them.
Halliday (1985:101) explains what he thinks of process in experiential metafunction, “What does it mean to say that a clause represents a process”? Our most powerful conception of reality is that it consists of “goings-on”; of doing, happening, feeling, being. These goings-on are sorted out in the semantic system of the language and expressed through the grammar of the clause. The major processes realized in the transitivity system are: material process, mental process, verbal process, and relational process, behavioural and existential processes. The other component of the ideational meaning is the logical system of the clause complex. “Clause complex is the term systemicists use for the grammatical and semantic unit formed when two or more clauses are linked together in certain systemic and meaningful ways” (Eggins 2004:255) Clause complex system helps the speaker to construe logical connection between experiential events. Both the logical and experiential functions work side by side to express ideational meanings.

The Textual Metafunction

Textual metafunction helps the writers to construct texts and also helps the readers to differentiate a text from a random set of sentences. This metafunction is realized through the thematic and information structures and various cohesive devices. The thematic structure helps to organize the text as message. Theme structure consists of two elements, Theme and Rheme. “The theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is connected. The remainder of the message, the part in which the Theme is developed is called the Rheme” (Halliday1994: 37). He defines Theme is “what message is concerned with: the point of departure for what the speaker is going to say” (Halliday; 1994: 38) Information structure is divided into two parts Given and New. The listener is already familiar with the Given part of the information. There is an exciting part of information in the New part for the listener.

The difference between the thematic structure and information structure is that theme structure is speaker oriented, while the information structure is listener-oriented.
oriented. (Halliday 1994: 299) Cohesion is of two types- referential cohesion and conjunctional cohesion. Reference is a relation between an element of a clause with some other element within or outside the text. Cohesion can also be established by means of the logical relations by connecting clauses and clause complexes. There is a relationship between one clause and another and cohesion helps the writer to determine these relationships.

**The Interpersonal Metafunction**

The information structure advances the flow of information. It gives the readers some idea what to expect, fulfilling those expectations and then reviewing them (Martin and Rose 2003:175).

The information function in Halliday and Matthiessen’s views (2004:106) views language as an “interactive event involving the speaker and the listener. In the act of interaction, the speaker adopts for himself a particular kind of speech role, and in so doing invites the listener to get into a complementary role. Mainly the two areas are covered through interpersonal metafunction; one is information exchange and the other is exchange of goods services. The interactive roles are of two types i.e. giving and demanding. The most used way to provide information is statement and the most used way of demanding information is a question. There are two other ways of providing information also i.e. offer and command. Interpersonal function is realized at the lexico-grammatical level mainly through three systems; Mood, Modality and Appraisal.

Mood refers to clause types, each mood type is based on two basic components i.e. the Subject and the Finite. The subject is the person or thing with which/who proposition is concerned. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 115) assert that finite “brings the proposition down to earth, so that it is something that can be argued about”. These two components of a clause constitute the nucleus of the proposition.
Modality can be defined as the grammatical source by which speakers/writers communicate degrees of their opinions. Modality construes the region of uncertainty that lies between “yes” and “no”. There are two subtypes of modality—Modalisation and Modulation. The main resources for the expression of modality are the finite modal operators that adjuncts, separate clauses and expansions of the indicator.


As the frame work for the present study is Appraisal Theory, realized by the extensive work on the use of evaluation in language carried by J.R Martin and his associates Peter White and David Rose, the theory is described in detail using examples mainly from the data the study is based on.

**The Appraisal Framework**

The Appraisal system is concerned with attitudinal lexis and lexical choices. Appraisal System is located as an interpersonal system at the level of discourse semantics. At this level it “co-articulates interpersonal meaning with two other systems; negotiation and involvement” (Martin and White 2005:33). Negotiation takes Appraisal by focusing on the interactive aspects of discourse, speech function and exchange structure (Martin 1992b) Involvement takes Appraisal by focusing on non-gradable resources for negotiating tenor relations,
especially solidarity. Martin and White (2005:34) are of the view, “at the level of tenor, power and solidarity need to be considered in relation to all the three discourse semantic systems i.e. Negotiation, Appraisal and Involvement” although involvement is especially tuned to the negotiation of group membership and social groups have status, so the implications of affiliation for power relations cannot be ignored.

Arlene Harvey (2004:254) writes that Appraisal is concerned with how speakers and writers adopt intersubjective and ideological positions in their texts through positive and negative evaluations of the Attitudes towards people, objects and events”. Geoff Thompson (1996:75) considers Appraisal as “a central part of the meaning of any text and that any analysis must take it into account” Martin(2000:145) defines Appraisal as a system of analyzing ‘semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, evaluations of human behaviour and valuations, along side resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations.

Appraisal system provides a comprehensive analytical framework to explore evaluative orientation in discourse. The focus of present thesis is on evaluative meanings which create and resist power structure in a text. We found Appraisal system, the most relevant to the present study because of its being an interpersonal semantic resource. Bakhtin’s concept of “axiology” (1984) also supports precedence of evaluation. So we found Appraisal theory as the most useful tool for the study to investigate the research questions posed in chapter I. As it is mentioned earlier that Appraisal theory will help in the identification of the evaluative resources used to build and negotiate power relations. Appraisal analysis aligns the dynamic nature of interpersonal evaluative meaning with prosodic structure (Martin and White 2005). In this structure cumulative building of meaning is brought out. In addition, Martin (1997) notes that the prosodic structure of interpersonal/evaluative meaning is related to generic structure, with the overall prosodic pattern differing according to generic stage (Martin and Rose 2003, Rothery and Stenglin 2000).
Appraisal has three domains:

Attitude

Engagement

Graduation

Attitude deals with our feelings that include our emotional reaction of things.

Attitude is further divided into three regions:

Affect

Judgement

Appreciation

Affect

These three semantic systems cover three regions as emotion, ethics and aesthetics. In Painter’s views (2003:84) emotion is always at the centre of three regions because physiologically too emotion starts from almost the moment of birth. Martin has named this emotion as Affect. Affect is related with positive and negative feelings. It is concerned with whether we feel happy or sad, confident or anxious, interested or bored. According to Halliday (1994), these emotional realizations comprise modification of participants and processes, affective mental and behavioural processes and model adjuncts. It also includes the usual range of grammatical metaphors (Halliday1994).

The classification of Affect as done by Martin and White (2005) is based on the following questions:

1. Are the feelings popularly construed by the culture as positive or negative ones?

I loved my father. Six foot tall, he had the presence of a film star. He was as handsome as my mother was beautiful. They made a very glamorous couple,
though my mother was the dominant partner and seemed a distant figure: he controlled his affection (Durrani 1995: 23).


He pressed rags drenched in chloroform over my daughter’s noses and stuffed them into a sack”(Durrani 1999: 202).

2 Are the feelings realized as a surge of emotion involving some kind of embodied paralinguistic or extra linguistic manifestation, or more internally experienced as a kind of emotive state or ongoing mental process?

*I cried out to God for forgiveness* as I gathered together the bits of consecrated paper (Durrani 1995: 352).

*My anger rose even as hopelessness invaded my entire being* (Durrani 1995: 181).

3 Are the feelings construed as directed or at reacting to some specific emotional trigger or as a general ongoing mood?

*He signed the papers and handed them to me as the children cried and pleaded with me not to break up our home. My face remained expressionless, my eyes dry, as I signed* (Durrani 1995: 364).

*I hated myself with madness and loved myself with sadness* (Durrani 1999: 40).

4 How are the feelings graded towards the lower values end of a scale of intensity or towards the higher value end or some where in between?

*I was cowered* (Durrani 1999: 40).

*I was whimpering* (Durrani 1999: 40).
I was petrified (Durrani1999: 40).

5 Do the feelings involve intention (rather than reaction), with respect to a stimulus that is irrealis (rather than realis)?

He scolded my petrified children for not knowing where they were going (Durrani1995:288).

I was homeless, destitute and scared (Durrani1995:365).

Emotions are divided into three Affect groups by Martin and White (2005) these are;

Un/happiness
In/security
Dis/satisfaction

Judgement

Judgement is the second major Attitude in the Appraisal theory given by Martin (2003). Judgement is concerned with the meaning construing our Attitudes to people and their behaviour and their character. Like Affect, Judgement also involves positive or negative assessments of human conduct by reference to system of social norms. This directly or indirectly reflects on the behaviour or performance of some human individual or grouping. In negative values of Judgement, discourse involves a sense of guilt or of disfunctionality of human individual or grouping. In negative values of Judgement, discourse involves a sense of guilt or of disfunctionality of human individual or grouping.

Judgement can be divided into two categories social sanction and social esteem. When we judge a person we more or less take the authority to judge him i.e. he is good or bad. When we come to this semantic resource, we concentrate on that language “which criticizes or praises, condemns or applauds the
behaviour, the actions, deeds, sayings, beliefs etc of human individuals and groups”. (Martin and White 2005:52).

Social Esteem:

Social esteem “tends to be policed in the oral culture: through chat, gossip, jokes and stories of various kinds with humor often having a critical role to play (Eggins and Slade 1997). When we share values in this area we form a social network of family, friends, colleagues etc.

Judgements of Social esteem have three subtypes:

Normality

Capacity

Tenacity

The instances of all the three subtypes of social esteem are as follows:

1 With the passage of time the privileged few multiplied their wealth by exploiting the feudal practices of tenant farming and arbitrary taxation (Durrani 1995:41).

2 “Tehmina, you are a complete woman” he said. You are exceptional...” (Durrani 1995:220).

3 His placid and complacent nature began to irritate me (Durrani 1995:60).

Social sanction

Social sanction is “codified in writing, as edicts, decrees, rules, regulations and laws about how to behave as surveilled by church and state with penalties and punishments as levers against those not complying with the code (Martin & White 2005). Social sanction has two sub types:

Veracity
Propriety

The instances of all the three subtypes of social sanction are as follows:

1 And, indeed, at some earlier time many were pious and righteous (Durrani 1999: 56).

2 To me my husband was my son’s murderer. He was also my daughter’s molester. A parasite nibbling on the Holy Book, he was Lucifer, holding me by throat and driving me to sin every night (Durrani 1999: 143).

These categories include positive and negative evaluations. “If there is too much negative social esteem, there may be the need to visit a therapist and if there is too much social sanction then the need is for the lawyer to be called in.” (Martin and White 2005:52).

Normality, Capacity and Tenacity have been grouped together under social esteem because their positive values result in increased social reputation and public esteem while their negative values result in decrease or loss of social esteem.

Veracity and Propriety have been grouped together under social sanction. This is the domain of ethical regulation of right and wrong.

The evaluations of Judgement can be inscribed or evoked. When the evaluation becomes naturalized by some factual description or taken for granted in a given cultural situation, it will be considered as inscribed Judgement. And when an utterance employs evaluative language which directs us towards a Judgement response, that response is called a provoked or evoked Judgement.
Appreciation

Appreciation involves meanings construing our evaluations of things. Appreciation includes things we make and performances we give and natural phenomena and their worth.

Appreciation is divided into three subtypes:

Reaction
Composition
Valuation

The instances of all the three categories of Appreciation are as follows:

1. *A chill of awareness enveloped me in one continuous throb of unceasing, unrelenting pain* (Durrani 1995:123).


Like Affect and Judgement, Appreciation can also be positive and negative. We value some properties positive and some negative. Reaction attaches our reaction to the things, composition tells us about the balance and complexity of the things. Valuation brings how innovative and authentic these things are. Martin and White (2005:57) consider valuation especially sensitive since the value of things depends so much on institutional focus". Eggins (1974) suggested considering reaction, composition and valuation in relation to mental processes grammatically. Reaction is related to emotion, composition is to perception and valuation is related to cognition. Martin and White (2005:57) has given an alternative that the Appreciation framework might be interpreted metafunctionally with reaction oriented to interpersonal significance, composition to textual organization and valuation to identical importance.
### Table 1: Subtypes of Appreciation (Martin and White 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>appreciation</th>
<th>mental process type</th>
<th>metafunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reaction</td>
<td>affection</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition</td>
<td>perception</td>
<td>textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuation</td>
<td>cognition</td>
<td>ideational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these dimensions, *valuation* is tied up with field since the criteria for valuing a text is for the most part institutionally specific so *valuation* does with our assessment of the social significance of the text.

**Inscribed/invoked Attitude**

Sometimes the selection of ideational meanings is enough to provoke evaluation even if there is not direct attitudinal lexis. Though it can be felt that provoked evaluation involves subjectivity into the analysis. And without invoking Attitude it is understood that the author tries to avoid taking the responsibility on his /her shoulders. So Martin and Rose(2003:62) opine, “in this context it is important to distinguish between individual and social subjectivity between readers as idiosyncratic respondents and communities of readers positioned by specific configurations of gender, generation, class, ethnicity and in/capacity” (Martin & Rose:62).

The instances of inscribed and invoked Attitude are as follows:

1. Considered to be a direct link between the Almighty and the wretched, people believed that his intervention could even alter what Allah had fated for them (Durrani1999: 54).
Graduation

The second major subsystem after Attitude is up-scaling and down-scaling of meanings that is described as Graduation. In Martin and White’s (2005:135) words, “Graduability is a general property of values of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation or negativity.” So we can say that the semantics of Graduation is central to the Appraisal system. In other words, we can realize Graduation as a resource that works on other values. It can intensify meanings by scaling them up or toning them down (Quarketial 1971). Graduation does not create new meanings but allows writer and reader to enter into a dialogue about the degree of experiential and interpersonal meanings. It is also used as a resource for dialogue to negotiate intersubjective positioning and reader alignment by scaling experiential and interpersonal meanings.

Graduation can be divided into two subcategories:

Force

Focus

Force: Force assesses the degree of intensity and as to amount. The degree of intensity is termed as Intensification and assessment of amount is termed as Quantification.

Intensifications are divided into five broad lexico-grammatical classes:

Isolating: Isolating turns on whether the up-scaling / down-scaling is realized by an isolated, individual item which performs the function of setting the level of intensity or whether the sense of up/down scaling is fused with a meaning which serves some semantic function.
**Infusion:** Infusion has no separate lexical form that conveys the sense of up-scaling or down-scaling. The scaling is conveyed as one aspect of the meaning of a single term for e.g. *I was frightened.*

**Maximization:** The uppermost end of the scale of intensification is named as “maximiser” (e.g. Quick, Green Baum, leech, Svartivik 1985) Maximisers construe the up-scaling as being at the highest possible intensity for e.g. *totally miserable, perfectly happy.*

**Lexicalization:** Intensification can also be carried out by isolated modifiers which are “lexical” rather than “grammatical” for e.g. *ice cold, crystal chandelier.*

**Repetition:** Intensification can be carried through repetition also. For example:

**Quantification:** *Quantification* involves scaling with respect to amount (size, weight, strength, number). The quantified entity can be either concrete (large jars, many jars) or abstract (a large problem, many problems).

*Quantification* has three modes:

- Number (a few, many)
- Mass (thin, thick)
- Extent (near, far)

These infusions often invoke metaphor which is to a greater or lesser degree delexicalised. For example: *a mountain of flesh.*

**Focus:** When Graduation operates according to prototypicality and the preciseness by which category boundaries are drawn, the term focus comes into the picture. Martin and White (2005:137) are of the view, “Graduation according to prototypicality (focus) applies most typically to categories which, when viewed from an experiential perspective, are not scalable”.
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Focus has two sub categories:

Sharpen

Soften

Under focus it is possible to upscale, or sharpen, the specification so that prototypicality is indicated (a true friend) or to downscale, or ‘soften”, the specification so as to characterize an instance as having only margined membership in the category (they are kind of crazy). Softening values have been already used with headings as “hedges” (Lakoff 1973) and “vague language” (Channel 1994) and sharpening of values have been used under the headings of intensifiers, boosters and amplifiers (Labov 1984 and Hyland 2000).

**Engagement**

The category of Engagement involves “those meanings which in various ways construe for the text a heteroglossic back drop of prior utterances, alternative view points and anticipated responses” (Martin and White 2005:97). Engagement is concerned with the sources of Attitude. It tries to answer the following question:

Who are the evaluations coming from?

In broad terms, utterances can be categorized in two ways. They can be classified as “monoglossic” when they make no reference to other voices and view points and as “heteroglossic” (Bakhtin 1981) when they do invoke or allow for dialogistic alternatives.

Engagement is concerned with the resources of intersubjective positioning. Martin and White share with Stubbs the view that “whenever speakers (or writers) say anything, they encode their point of view towards it (Stubbs 1996:197). Martin and White (2005:93) are of the view, “all utterances to some degree take into account or respond to prior utterance and to some degree
anticipate or acknowledge likely responses, reactions and objections from actual or potential dialogic partners”. Russian linguist Bakhtin shares the same view that, “utterances exist…. against a back drop of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points of view and value Judgements pregnant with responses and objections”(Bakhtin 1981:281).

Heteroglossic resources can be divided into two broad categories:

Dialogic expansion

Dialogic contraction

Any utterance that makes allowance for dialogically alternative positions and voices may be called as dialogic expansion. The dialogical expansion can be further divided into two subtypes:

Entertain

Attribute

Attribute is further divided into two categories as Acknowledge and Distance. When an utterance restricts the scope of dialogically alternative positions and voices it is named as Dialogic Contraction. The Dialogic Contraction is further divided into two categories:

Disclaim

Proclaim.

Disclaim has two types:

Deny

Counter

Proclaim has three types:
Concur

Pronounce

Endorse

Martin and White have again divided concur into two types:

Affirm

Concede

Engagement aims to find out the dialogistic perspective under which the issue of who/what is the primary source of the proposition and also how the authorial voice positions itself with respect to the anticipated reactions and responses of the audience which is being construed of the text. Other framework for sourcing like Sinclair’s notion of attribution have a perspective or anticipatory orientation in which the text builds for itself an audience and presents itself as engaging in various ways with the audience.

The brief sketch of Appraisal framework provides the researcher with a theoretical framework to analyze the texts under investigation. This framework helps to explore lexico-grammatical resources used for the grammatical and interpersonal meanings in the two texts by Tehmina Durrani i.e. My Feudal Lord and Blasphemy and how these meanings negotiate for power in these two texts. The present thesis will only concentrate on Attitude, amplifiers and the monologic and heteroglossic part of Engagement for the analysis due to limitations of time and space.